UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,609	02/18/2004	Farni Weaver	2284	2700
28005 SPRINT	7590 08/31/200	9	EXAMINER	
6391 SPRINT F			PEACHES, RANDY	
KSOPHT0101-Z2100 OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/31/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/781,609	WEAVER, FARNI
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	RANDY PEACHES	2617
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	he correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS rute, cause the application to become ABAND	TION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ TI 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters,	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 14,16,17,20 and 21 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 18 and 19 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the	ccepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. ection is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a life.	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appli riority documents have been rec eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Sumn Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/781,609 Page 2

Art Unit: 2617

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of *claims 14 and 16-21* are withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Hicks et al.. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain <u>a</u> patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

1. Claim 19 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 18. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Application/Control Number: 10/781,609 Page 3

Art Unit: 2617

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 14, 16-17 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hicks et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,016,424).

Regarding *claim 14*, Hicks et al. discloses a message delivery method providing a mobile station user notification of the delay of teleservices, comprising:

- determining whether a delay timer parameter (Delay-TMR)(40), which reads on claim "expected delay," for delivery of an electronic message is less than a R-delay period (95), which reads on claim, "threshold delay,", wherein the said (Delay-TMR)(40) is the expected delay for delivery of an electronic message by a Base station/mobile station interworking function (BMI, column 2 lines 20-30), which reads on claim "message gateway." See column 2 lines 42-67;
- creating the electronic message only after determining that the said (Delay-TMR)(40), is less than the said R-delay period (95). See column 3 lines 60-67 and column 4 lines 1-5, whereby Hicks teaches that if a new teleservice transaction is to be sent a new message is created and replaces the messages in the queue; and
- sending the electronic message to the said BMI only after determining that the said (Delay-TMR)(40) is less than the said R-delay period (95). See column 3 lines 1-8 and column 4 lines 2-5.

Art Unit: 2617

Regarding *claim 16*, according to *claim 14*, Hicks et al. continues to disclose wherein determining whether the (Delay-TMR)(40) is less than a threshold delay includes sending a R-Data message (25), which reads on claim "delay query." See column 2 lines 45-59.

Regarding *claim* 17, according to *claim* 14, Hicks et al. continues to disclose wherein determining whether the (Delay-TMR)(40) is less than a R-delay period (95) includes receiving a R-Data Information element (35), which reads on claim "received delay report." See column 2 lines 49-59.

Regarding *claim 20*, according to *claim 14*, Hicks et al. continues to disclose wherein determining whether the (Delay-TMR)(40) exceeds a R-delay period (95) includes:

- receiving a R-Data Information element (35), that indicates the length of the said
 (Delay-TMR)(40). See column 2 lines 49-59; and
- comparing the (Delay-TMR)(40) to the R-delay period (95). See column 3 lines 34-51.

Regarding *claim 21*, according to *claim 14*, Hicks et al. continues to disclose wherein the electronic message is a short message service message. See column 2 lines 26-34.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to *claims 14, 16-17 and 19-21* have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RANDY PEACHES whose telephone number is (571) 272-7914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/781,609 Page 6

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Randy Peaches/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Charles N. Appiah/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617